



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/809,444

03/26/2004

Sotomitsu Ikeda

02922.000205.

8112

5514

7590

01/02/2009

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

KANE, CORDELIA P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2432

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/02/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/809,444	Applicant(s) IKEDA, SOTOMITSU	
	Examiner CORDELIA KANE	Art Unit 2432	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed November 17, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that none of the references teaches determining whether or not the contents information to be output has been registered and/or corrected. However, Teraura teaches determining whether the ID number of the operator is valid and then stores it (page 5, paragraph 89 and 92). Also, Ostrover discloses, storing an electronic copy of the content of the document in the microchip attached to the document (column 6, lines 15-21). Therefor Teraura in view of Petteruti in view of Ostrover teaches determining whether or not the contents information to be output is registered. Applicant claims determining whether or not the contents information to be outputted is registered and/or corrected. Since the language is in the alternative form only one aspect needs to be taught. Therefor the determining if the contents information has been corrected is not necessary. Therefor the output device and managing device are not necessary either since determining if the output is corrected is not required to be determined.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on September 22, 2008 was filed after the mailing date of the non-final action on August 15, 2008. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 11 – 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraura, in view of Petteruti and further in view of Ostrover et al's US Patent 6,585,154 B1. Referring to claims 11, 14 and 17, Teraura teaches:
 - a. An identification device that identifies identification information of a recording medium to which the contents information is to be printed (page 1, paragraph 17).
 - b. A second determination device that determines whether or not the contents of the information which is designated for printing has been registered (page 5, paragraph 89 and 92). It is determined whether the ID number of the operator is valid and then stores it.
3. Teraura does not explicitly disclose determining whether or not the recording medium is a medium on which printing of the contents information is permitted and inhibiting printing if it is determined that the medium is not the medium on which printing is permitted. However, Petteruti discloses checking the print commands to see if they are valid for the printer (media) and if they are not valid ignoring the command (column 4, lines 46-57). Teraura and Petteruti are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, printing using RFID. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Teraura and

Art Unit: 2432

Petteruti before him or her, to modify the printing of Teraura to include the verification of Petteruti. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to be sure the printer is the correct printer type (column 4, lines 52-55).

4. Teraura and Petteruti does not explicitly disclose registering the contents information printed by the printed device. However, Ostrover discloses, storing an electronic copy of the content of the document in the microchip attached to the document (column 6, lines 15-21). Teraura, Petteruti, and Ostrover are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, radio tags. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Teraura in view of Petteruti and Ostrover before him or her, to modify the system of Teraura in view of Petteruti to include the electronic copy of Ostrover. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been so that the information in the chip could match visual data such as text or a document (column 1, lines 46-47).

5. The limitations of the output device are not being addressed for the reasons explained in the 112 2nd rejection. The limitations for the managing device depend from the output device and are not being addressed for the same reason.

6. Referring to claim 12, Teraura teaches that the determination by the first and second determination devices is carried out in cooperation with a management apparatus (page 5, paragraph 89, 90 and 92).

7. Referring to claim 13, Teraura teaches in a case in which the second determination device determines that the contents information designated for printing

has not been registered, the print device prints the contents information designated for printing to the recording medium (page 5, paragraph 93),

8. Referring to claim 15, Teraura teaches an information processing apparatus that designates the contents for printing (page 5, paragraph 92).

9. Referring to claim 16, Teraura teaches identifying the recording medium by reading the identification information sent from the radio section (page 5, paragraph 92). For the control circuit to know to select the paper tray with the RFID tag paper in it, it would have to read the RFID.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CORDELIA KANE whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2432

(571)272-7771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 2432

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2432